DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 212 HE 013 320

AUTHOR Zanoni, Candido P.
TITLE The 1979-80 General College Retention Program, Final Report: Pilot Education Programs.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. General Coll.
SPONS AGENCY Minnesota State Dept. of Education, St. Paul.
PUB DATE 15 Nov 80
NOTE 19p.: For related documents, see HE 013 321-322.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement: *Academic Persistence: American Indians: Basic Skills: Black Students: Career Planning: College Attendance: *College Students: Cultural Context: *Educational Counseling: Educationally Disadvantaged: Ethnic Groups: Higher Education: Interdisciplinary Approach: Latin Americans: Learning Modules: Mexican Americans: *Minority Groups: Pilot Projects: Program Costs: Program Evaluation: *School Holding Power: Student Attrition: Student Characteristics: Student Evaluation: *Tutorial Programs
IDENTIFIERS *University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT

Efforts of the General College of the University of Minnesota to increase student retention during the 1979-80 academic year are described. The target groups were high-risk students, especially representatives of minority groups from traditionally nonacademic populations. The college mounted a pilot education program (PEP) comprising three parallel but distinct packages to serve American Indians, Chicano/Latinos, and Blacks. The PEP packages, which were specifically designed to be relevant to the characteristics of the students enrolled, contained interdisciplinary modules consisting of the following components: skills development courses, subject matter courses focusing on the cultural values of each ethnic group: support seminars offering tutorial assistance and survival information (economic, social, and educational): career planning sessions: and individual advice and counseling. In order to coordinate efforts, instructors and counselors in each of the PEP packages met weekly during the year to discuss mutual problems, policies, and procedures for the conduct of teaching and support service activities. Information is presented on evaluation of the program, student characteristics, evaluation of students by traditional measures of academic success, retention rates for PEP students, and program costs. Reports on the Chicano/Latino package and on the overall program are published separately. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED195212

PEP pilot education programs

FINAL REPORT 1979-1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

General College

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE013320

general college

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Dean

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

General College
108 Nicholson Hall
216 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

November 19, 1980

Frank Wilderson
Vice President, Student Affairs
110 Morrill Hall

Dear Frank:

In the fall of 1979, the General College received through the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs (OMSSA) a part of a University Legislative Special designated for retention. With this allocation, the General College mounted an academic retention program for various groups of minority students. According to the terms of our original proposal to OMSSA, the General College understood that it was obligated to prepare an accounting of the use of the funds allocated to us and an evaluation of our retention program. The attached report is submitted to you as a fulfillment of that commitment.

The report and the documents accompanying it are, I believe, clear and convincing testimony to the faithful expenditure of the funds provided to us for retention efforts and to the success of the program that the funds helped to create.

The attached report speaks for itself. However, if you or any of your colleagues would like clarification or elaboration of any point in it, both Professor Zanoni, the primary author, and I are available to discuss its contents with you at your convenience.

I would appreciate any reaction that you might have to the attached report.

Cordially,

Jeanne T. Lupton
Dean

JTL/rmr
CC: C. Peter Magrath
Nils Hasselmo
Stanley B. Kegler
Kenneth Keller
Clinton T. Johnson
Candido Zanoni

THE 1979-1980

GENERAL COLLEGE RETENTION PROGRAM

Final Report

November 15, 1980

by

Candido P. Zanoni

PEP Program Coordinator

General College

Acknowledgements

I owe special thanks to Professor Alex Kurak for his expert editorial assistance and constructive suggestions concerning the structure and content of this report, and to Miss Teri Lawson for typing and seeing the entire project through to its completion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

The 1979-80 General College Retention Program: Final Report — Candido P. Zanoni

Introduction 1

Program Description 2

Program Evaluation 4

1. Demographic Profile of Students Enrolled in the PEP Program 5

2. PEP Students as Evaluated by Traditional Measures of Academic Success 6

3. Retention Rates for PEP Students During the 1979-80 Academic Year 8

Program Costs 10

Conclusions and Recommendations 11

Appendices

Appendix A: A Curricular Experiment for Underprepared Minority Students: An Evaluation of the General College Pilot Educational Packages (PEP) — John L. Romano and Joan B. Garfield

Appendix B: The Commanding English Program: Its Development, Use, Misuse, and Abuse — A Communication Analysis — Evelyn Unes Hansen

Appendix C: PEP Packages: Required Courses, 1979-80

Appendix D: Summary of PEP Costs, 1979-80 — Candido P. Zanoni

Introduction

The 1979 session of the Minnesota Legislature appropriated a special fund to the University of Minnesota for a two-year program of student retention—that is, for the University to use in devising incentives to encourage students to continue their educations instead of dropping out after a brief period of schooling. The target groups for this legislative special were the so-called "high-risk" students—especially representatives of minority groups from traditionally "non-academic" populations. This report deals with the General College's contribution to the University's effort at student retention during the 1979-80 academic year.

During the summer of 1979, the General College applied to the University of Minnesota central administration for funds to mount a retention program for four groups of students. The College's application was only partially successful. In late summer, 1979, the University central administration allotted the General College $52,700 for the purpose of planning and developing a retention program for two groups: entry-level American Indians and entry-level Chicano/Latinos. These funds constituted the University's allocation for the first year of the General College's 1979-81 retention program. Since the allocation was made late in the summer of 1979, the College began immediate planning with the intention of having a working program ready for students arriving in fall quarter, 1979.

In the process of designing the General College's retention program, it became evident that a feature of the original plan—a component serving Black students—was desirable. Accordingly, the General College channelled whatever resources were available from its own budget into the retention program in order to extend it beyond that which was supported by University funds. With this additional money, it was possible to plan a program for three groups—American Indians, Chicano/Latinos, and Blacks. For each of these groups of students, the College mounted a Pilot Education Program (PEP) comprising three parallel but distinct Pilot Education Packages.[1]

In accepting University funds for a new, untried program (and in expending its own slim resources for an experimental effort), the General College assumed an obligation to account accurately for the manner in which the money was spent and to demonstrate that such expenditures were in accordance with the University's (and the Legislature's) general understanding of the purposes and objectives of a student retention program. At the same time, it was recognized that a careful

---

[1]For convenience in this report, the acronym "PEP" is used with both "program" and "package." The "PEP Program" is the total General College retention program; "PEP package" refers to the individual parts of the whole program. "PEP I" designates the package for American Indians; "PEP II" refers to both parts (monolingual and bilingual) of the Chicano/Latino package; and "PEP III" denotes the package for Black students.

First, it appears that the intense support and skills development classes afforded PEP students during the fall and winter quarters were too drastically reduced during the spring quarter. Serious motivational problems arose because students did not want to be "held back" by non-transferable skills-course credits. Students insisted upon "transferable" courses even though they did not have the requisite skills to succeed in such courses. Rectification of this problem—another priority item for current PEP program planners—points to the need for more persuasive in-depth and professional counseling and advising of PEP students.

A second factor affecting the retention rate of PEP students was that alluded to earlier—unprepared PEP students enrolling in non-General College courses.

A third determining factor mentioned by PEP counselors and advisors involved financial aid. Financial aid for several PEP students was delayed during the spring quarter; since most of these students had no other financial resources available to them, they simply dropped out of school.

A final factor in spring quarter retention involved student enrollment in mathematics courses. Too many unprepared PEP students chose self-paced math courses. The completion rate for PEP students in such courses was not good, indicating that PEP students should be encouraged to enroll in teacher-instructed courses.

PEP planners believe that problems of these kinds, once identified, can be readily corrected as the PEP program continues. Careful advising and monitoring of student progress is the key; special efforts in these areas will be made during the 1980-81 academic year.

Program Costs

In the initial stages of the development of the PEP program, the administration of the General College understood that the $52,700 of OMSSA funding granted to the College for the PEP program would not be sufficient to mount a full-fledged comprehensive retention program. Individual cultural courses for each of the PEP packages had to be created; teaching teams for each package had to be organized; the structure for cooperation and integration of effort within and between members of the three teaching teams had to be established; searches for minority and ethnic instructors, teaching assistants and peer counselors had to be instituted; and appropriate teaching materials, teaching techniques and strategies had to be devised. In short, considerable financial resources beyond those granted by OMSSA had to be committed in order to plan, staff and "fine-tune" the individual PEP packages prior to their implementation. Since the College envisaged such a program to be the core of its continuing retention efforts, it sought to contrive a retention program that could stand as a paradigm for all retention efforts within the College and within the University.

The need for additional funding beyond that provided by OMSSA was met by Dean Jeanne T. Lupton's diversion of $33,000 of reallocation funds returned to the College from the University's 1978-79 retrenchment. (Since these funds were returned to the College for its skills development and retention efforts, this diversion of funds into the PEP program was in accordance with the conditions specified in the reallocation.) In addition to these funds, the College's commitment to the PEP program included all costs for administering the program; for required budgetary accounting; for program, packages and course evaluations; and for supplies, materials, typing and secretarial services. Thus, every cent of designated funds (OMSSA's and reallocation) was expended for purely academic and counseling functions.

While $85,700 was designated for purely academic and counseling functions of the PEP program, actual expenses for these purposes amounted to $87,564. Appended to this report is the "Summary of PEP Costs: 1979-80," a detailed financial accounting of the General College retention program expenditure through spring quarter, 1980. In this summary, particular attention should be given to the expenditures for the two Chicano/Latino packages, which together account for $35,509, or 63.4%, of the entire academic-year instructional costs for the three PEP packages. This heavy outlay for the Chicano-Latino students was made necessary by the need to devise two specialized—and, for the most part, separate—Chicano/Latino packages, one for monolingual students and one for bilingual students. To meet the specialized needs of the monolingual package, the General College hired additional instructional staff from the Department of Spanish-Portuguese graduate-student teaching pool.

Of particular concern to the PEP program administration is this fact about future: As the College is increasingly required to hire "outside" minority and ethnic instructional staff, costs for the three PEP packages will increase proportionately. A review of costs for the 1980-81 PEP program shows this increase already appearing. In competition within the University for "key" minority and ethnic instructors, the General College has had to pay salaries above its standard rates. Fortunately, in the 1980-81 budget this growing obligation has been met from three sources: 1) the funds preserved by phasing out the monolingual Chicano/Latino package; 2) the funds saved by the non-renewal of start-up costs; and 3) the funds generated by increased efficiencies in administering, evaluating, and carrying on the PEP program.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The evaluation of the PEP program's first year produced a convergence of evidence—this report, its appended documents, verbal reports and other formal and informal sources—that supports the conclusion that the General College academic retention program is accomplishing the retention goals envisaged for it by the College and by the University. Of course, like all new experimental efforts, the planning and implementing of the PEP program was not without occasional glitches, snafus, and foul-ups. Nevertheless, the planners of PEP are convinced that the aim of encouraging students to continue their studies in the University can be achieved by an educational model like the PEP program.

Viewed at this point, the program seems to be working: the administrative machinery is functioning smoothly, and the individual PEP package staff members are beginning to meld into cohesive and effective teaching teams.

With respect to the future of the program, some points have already been mentioned. The pressing need for more ethnic and minority-group staff members, for instance, was noted above. With the successful recruitment of minority instructors, counselors, advisers and teaching assistants for the 1980-81 offering of the PEP program, this need has been adequately met. Also in the second year's program, some problems have been solved by a more stringent monitoring of student progress, by more persuasive and effective academic counseling and advising, and by more efficient tutorial services. Experience thus far has also shown that one part of the PEP program that will require increased attention and commitment is the career-planning module in each of the packages. PEP staff members report that too many PEP students have unrealistic career expectations. Accordingly, staff members recommend that the career-planning seminars be extended in scope and that attendance be required for all PEP students.

In sum, many lessons have been learned in the first year of the PEP program; where necessary, changes have been made—and continue to be made—to meet the ever-increasing and varied academic and counseling needs of PEP students.

There are, however, some factors over which the General College has little or no control but that, nevertheless, have a direct bearing on the success or failure of future PEP offerings. These factors include recruitment, student financial aid, and program costs.

Recruitment. The first year's experience with PEP students—in particular, with students in the Chicano/Latino package—has raised the question about what kinds of students should be recruited by OMSSA for the PEP program. Although a high school diploma or a GED certificate are not necessary conditions for admittance to the General College, it does seem advisable to screen potential students carefully with respect to their academic preparation. There is a threshold of academic underpreparedness; the General College has neither the personnel nor the financial resources to mount an academic program for students below a certain level.

Student Financial Aid. Most students registered in the PEP program are on some form of financial aid and cannot continue in school without such assistance. It is imperative that financial aid agreements with individuals students be finalized each quarter in time for both students and PEP faculty to plan ahead.

A review should also be made of the requirement that students enroll for a minimum of twelve credits in order to qualify for financial aid. For students who are as academically underprepared as are some of the PEP students, perhaps a lower credit requirement during the first quarter in school should be considered. A reduced credit load would enable such students to devote more time to the development of requisite study habits

and skills. With a lighter load, PEP students could more easily learn to cope with, and adjust to, the often hectic and traumatic life of the first-year university student.

Program Costs. It seems obvious that the General College PEP program should be continued and expanded to assist ever greater numbers of minority and disadvantaged students. But the General College, with its meager resources, cannot afford any increase of expenditures from its own funds for this purpose without jeopardizing its primary commitment to the majority of its students in its other programs. OMSSA's contribution to the General College retention program for minority students, while generous, is small in proportion to the number of such students enrolled in the General College. During the fall quarter, 1980, for instance, the General College enrolled 607 minority students, fully 24% of the entire Twin City Campus minority enrollment.[6] Of these 607 students, 354 are OMSSA-certified students, 41% of OMSSA's entire minority enrollment. Data of this kind clearly indicate the OMSSA's and the University's support of the General College retention program is not in proportion to the number of minority students involved.

There is another consideration that grows ineluctably from the College's experience with PEP during this past year. Within the University there is a large segment of the student body whose retention probabilities could be significantly improved by the kind of academic assistance provided by the PEP program. There is, for example, the increasingly large number of Asian/Pacific students (157 fall, 1980) for whom a separate PEP package is desparately needed. At present, no OMSSA funding has been provided the General College to assist these students.

At the time of this writing, Dr. Nobuya Tsuchida, Director of the University's Asian/Pacific American Learning Center, and Professor Sandra Flake, Coordinator of the General College's ACP Division's Commanding English program, have received a $5,793 Educational Development Program (EDP) grant to begin work on an Asian/Pacific academic retention package. Since the EDP funds were not sufficient to mount a complete retention program, Dr. Tsuchida and Professor Zanoni, Coordinator of the PEP program, submitted to the State Department of Public Welfare a $77,522 grant proposal for a "Commanding English Program for Indochinese Refugees and Extension English Courses for Hmong Bilingual Workers." Because this grant proposal was favorably reviewed by the State Department of Public Welfare and with the expectation of receiving these funds, the General College committed its own funds to begin the program fall quarter, 1980. Thus, during the fall quarter, 1980, the General College instituted three specialized programs for Indochinese students: an Asian Commanding English program (ACE); an Asian Special Training program (ASPECT); and, with the assistance of Dr. Mark Landa of the University's English as a Second Language program, an ESL program.

Even if, in the most optimistic view, the General College were to receive all of the funds it requested in its State Department of Public

---

[6]The data mentioned here are taken from a report provided by the Office of Admissions and Records, Data Retrieval Center.

Welfare grant proposal, there is still no assurance that such funding would continue beyond 1980-81. In any case, the need remains: Asian/Pacific students on campus will require retention aid. Since the General College cannot continue to supply such retention aid from its own resources, and since most Asian/Pacifics on campus are OMSSA certified students, it seems an obvious conclusion that the kinds of retention efforts devoted to other minority groups on campus should also be accorded Asian/Pacific students. Thus, a recommendation that grows out of this report is that the University central administration should assume the responsibility of funding a retention program in the General College for Asian/Pacific students now on campus and for those who will appear in our midst in the future.

Another category of retention concern in the University is the growing number of foreign/international students who might advantageously avail themselves of instruction, not through the PEP program, but through the General College's Commanding English program.[7] Dr. Tsuchida and Dr. Landa agree that there is a large number of foreign/international students in the University who could profit, either from enrolling in the Commanding English program, or from using parts of the program as a supplement to their work in ESL.

To summarize, there is little doublt that there are many students in the University for whom effective retention aid is required. The plight of these students ought to be a matter of serious concern to the central administration of the University.

---

[7]In 1979-80, the General College's Commanding English program for foreign/international students was funded by an EDP grant. Since such a program is quite expensive, it is doubtful that the College itself could assume the fiscal burden of this program in the future.

record of costs and a well-designed system of evaluation of methodology and outcomes were essential to a report that would be necessary after the completion of the first year of the program. What follows is a partial fulfillment of the College's obligation to account for funds spent on its retention program: a report on the General College PEP program, including a description of its components, an evaluation of its operation, and a specification of the program's costs through spring quarter, 1980.

Program Description

The General College retention program is founded on the premise that providing means of encouraging academic improvement will result in the long-range retention of those students who, by traditional measures, would ordinarily be expected to fail or drop out of the University. These are the so-called "high-risk" students; in the past they have often come from groups that comprise ethnic and racial minorities in the society at large. The basic educational structure designed for these students in the General College retention program is the Pilot Education Package (PEP).

The PEP package for each of the three groups of students—American Indian, Chicano/Latino, and Black—consists of components specifically designed to be relevant to the characteristics of the students enrolled. Each is a three-quarter (full academic year), integrated, interdisciplinary set of modules consisting of skills development courses (reading, writing, speaking, mathematics); subject-matter courses focusing on the cultural values of each ethnic group; support seminars offering tutorial assistance and "survival" information (economic, social, and educational); career-planning sessions; and individual advising and counseling. (See "PEP Packages: Required Courses, 1979-80 appended.)

In order to coordinate efforts and to assure disciplined and effective teaching and counseling, instructors and counselors in each of the PEP packages met weekly during the year to discuss mutual problems and to set common principles, policies, and procedures for the conduct of their teaching and support service activities. Thus, for example, problem students or students with excessive absences were immediately identified, and joint efforts by members of the "teaching team" were employed to resolve such difficulties. Appended to this document is a report by Professor Evelyn Hansen, a member of the Chicano/Latino teaching team. Professor Hansen's report provides background information about the development of the Chicano/Latino PEP package; describes how the Chicano/Latino team functioned; explains the nature, content and teaching methods employed in her classes; and evaluates the outcomes of her efforts. Similar reports about other segments of the PEP program, prepared by individual instructors and counselors in each of the PEP packages, are available in the General College office.

Built into the design of the General College retention program was a deliberate "sheltering" of each group of PEP students, not only from each other but also from the University student body in general. That

is, for the first two quarters of the academic year, each PEP group did all of its course work separately. The gradual integration of PEP students into the general student body began during the third quarter of the academic year. In every instance in which it was possible, qualified ethnic-group instructors, counselors, and peer advisors were recruited for each of the functions in each of the PEP package modules. Members of the University's Consolidated HELP Center staff participated in various ways as advisors and counselors to students enrolled in the PEP program. Directors of the University's Learning Resource Centers were consulted frequently and kept informed of the development and progress of the program. At an early stage of the program's development, it became clear that minority and ethnic instructors for the PEP packages were imperative. An effort was made to recruit some who might be available.[2]

In further pursuit of this objective, the General College, during the spring quarter, 1980, established separate PEP advisory committees for each of the three minority groups. The directors of the three Learning Resource Centers on the University campus agreed to serve as chairpersons of these committees. Thus, Ms. Flo Wiger of the American Indian Learning Resource Center and Ms. Vera Rorie of the Black Learning Resource Center became chairpersons of PEP I (American Indian) and PEP III (Black) planning committees, respectively. In the absence of a permanent director of the Juarez/Humphrey Chicano/Latino Supportive Services Center, Silverio Fuentes and Jesus Santiago assumed responsibility for coordinating the PEP II (Chicano/Latino) advisory committee. The PEP committees—composed of the directors of the Learning Resource Centers, members of the HELP Center staff, instructors in each of the packages, and the coordinator of the General College PEP program—met throughout the spring quarter, 1980, and during the summer to plan the 1980-81 curriculum; to institute searches for appropriate minority and ethnic instructors; and to oversee the effectiveness of their respective PEP packages. In addition, a working relationship was formally established with Nathan Smith, the Director of OMSSA's Summer Institute, in order to effect an orderly assignment of students from the Institute's summer program into the General College's PEP program. (Since no OMSSA funds were allocated for Asian Pacific students, no PEP package was created to assist such students. See Conclusions and Recommendations.)

Of the three PEP packages comprising the retention program, the two for American Indians and Blacks were most readily planned, staffed, and implemented. The Chicano/Latino package, however, presented special difficulties. Since the planners of the Chicano/Latino package did not

---

[2]During 1979-80, Professor Hinojosa-Smith, Chairman of the Department of Chicano Studies, graciously consented to supervise the fall-quarter offering of Migrants in Minnesota. In winter quarter, 1980, the course, Chicano History: An Historical Survey, was supervised by Professor Arturo Madrid, Associate Dean and Executive Officer of the College of Liberal Arts. The course instructor was Paul Carrizales, Instructor/Counselor in the Reading Skills Center of the Office of Student Affairs.

know in advance that some of the students recruited for it were monolingual, a problem arose at the outset. As the program began in the fall of 1979, the College was confronted with two different groups of Chicano/Latino students, each with somewhat different educational needs: some bilingual (Spanish/English) speakers and some monolingual (Spanish-speaking only) students. Since provision had orginally been made only for bilingual Chicano/Latino students, a second Chicano/Latino PEP package had to be hastily designed and implemented to meet the special needs of the monolingual Chicano/Latino students. Special instructors, tutors, and peer advisors had to be recruited and trained. The total cost of the Chicano/Latino package was thus increased beyond what had been originally allocated for that part of the total program.[3] (See "Summary of PEP Costs: 1979-80" appended.)

Program Evaluation

A definitive evaluation of the General College retention program obviously cannot be made on the basis of data from only one year of operation. A full report of the program would include an assessment of its effectiveness in terms of student retention over a longer period of time, ideally until each student in the program progresses as far as possible toward his/her individual educational goal. The General College is, of course, committed to the long-range retention of PEP students--as, indeed, it

---

[3]Among PEP program staff members there is some concern about the recruitment of monolingual students for the program by the University of Minnesota Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs (OMSSA). PEP staff members have, for instance, made the following points about this practice:

-- The costs of a PEP package for monolingual Chicano/Latinos, in addition to a package for bilingual Chicano/Latinos, impose an unduly heavy drain on the General College retention budget for one segment of the student population.

-- Since some of the monolingual students recruited for PEP in 1979-80 had not had previous educational training equivalent to that of American high schools, the need for remedial instruction for them has been extensive.

-- Since the monolingual Chicano/Latino's previous English-language training has been minimal, they were not adequately prepared for the college-level English as a Second Language (ESL) program. (Eligibility for admission to ESL requires a minimum score of 45 on the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency.)

-- Since monolingual Chicano/Latino students are extremely "high-risk" students--much more so than others recruited for the General College retention program--it can be said (and indeed it is being said) that OMSSA's recruitment of such students is an instance of recruiting for failure rather than recruiting for success.

is committed to the retention of all its students—beyond the period of their enrollment in the experimental PEP program.

At this point in the development of the PEP retention program, some observations can be made about its effectiveness. There is, for example, reason to believe that the PEP package concept is an effective instructional mode for the General College retention program. There is also evidence that the program's measurement instruments are adequate to assess the impact of the total program on student retention.

Evaluation of the PEP program during its first year (1979-80) concentrated on three areas: student demographics, student academic success, and student retention rate. Each of these areas is discussed below.

1. Demographic profile of students enrolled in the PEP program.

Perhaps no single group of students in the history of the General College has been so minutely examined and monitored as that group enrolled in the PEP program. In order to focus the retention program on the special needs of students in the individual PEP packages, evaluators of the program accumulated various kinds of data about them: academic histories, cultural and social backgrounds, the level of study skills and academic motivation, and other self-reporting concerns. Demographic information of this kind assisted PEP program planners in determining what types of students profited most from the program, what kinds of students should be recruited in the future, and how the program could be modified to serve these and future students. About the 116 PEP students (36 American Indian, 42 Chicano/Latino, and 38 Black), some interesting demographic data is summarized here briefly.[4]

In comparison with two control groups (composed of a non-PEP peer group and a typical General College freshman class) PEP students

-- had lower than average high school percentile ranks

-- scored similarily in organizational ability and arithmetic entrance examinations, but lower in verbal ability and algebra examinations

-- were older (thirty-three percent were over twenty-two years)

-- had parents with lower educational levels and fewer parents with post-secondary training or educations

[4]The statistical data used in this report are taken from A Curriculum Experiment for Underprepared Minority Students: An Evaluation of the General College Pilot Educational Packages (PEP), by John L. Romano and Joan B. Garfield, appended.

-- identified language skills and mathematics as subject areas in which they expected to need tutorial and remedial assistance

-- were more likely to indicate that they needed academic, career, and financial counseling

-- were more likely (+80%) to be receiving some form of financial aid

Demographic information of this kind confirmed the expectations of the program planners that PEP students required an intensive, comprehensive, and integrated language and mathematical skills program. Obvious also was the need for adequate support services—study skills training, tutorials, and counseling—to assist students in their academic and related activities. In addition, PEP program planners foresaw the need in each PEP package for a cultural course that would assist each student to become aware of, and to take pride in, his/her cultural identity. The success of the PEP program thus far would seem to support the correctness of the PEP planners conjectures about the needs of students like those who enrolled in the PEP program.

2. PEP students as evaluated by traditional measures of academic success.

During the evaluation of the PEP packages at the end of the first year (1979-80), evaluators of the PEP program collected data about such indicators as student grade-point averages (GPA) and the ratio of credits completed to those attempted (CCR). This information was collated for each PEP package separately as well as for the total PEP program.

Pertinent statistics concerning PEP student GPA's and CCR's, compared with the same data from the two control groups, produced interesting findings, some of which are summarized here briefly.

a. Compared with students in the two control groups, PEP students achieved a statistically higher GPA (with N grades excluded) than students in the control groups. Within the PEP packages, Chicano/Latino students achieved somewhat higher GPA's than the American Indian and Black students.

b. With N grades included, PEP students achieved about the same GPA as students in the control groups. Again, Chicano/Latino students realized higher GPA's than students in the other two PEP packages.

c. PEP students registered for more credits than students in the two control groups. They also registered for more language skills and non-General College courses than students in the control groups. In both of these categories, Chicano/Latino students attempted more courses than students in the other PEP packages.

d. The percentage of credits completed (CCR) by PEP students was equal to those of the non-PEP peer group, but lower than those of the typical freshman class. Among PEP students, the highest completion rate was attained by the Chicano/Latino students.

e. Course completion rates in non-General College courses was less among PEP students than for students in the control groups. Completion rates were highest in the Chicano/Latino package.

f. Twenty-four percent of the PEP students achieved a cumulative GPA of 2.00 or above, and completed 75% of their credits attempted. This percentage compares with 22% of the non-PEP peer group and 47% of the typical General College class control group.

g. Younger students tended to have higher GPA's and CCR's than students twenty-three years of age and older.

h. In both PEP and the two control groups, female students had lower CCR's than males. However, excluding N grades, female students in PEP averaged higher GPA's than their male counterparts. With N grades included, there is no significant difference in GPA's among males and females in the PEP packages and in the control groups.

By traditional measures of academic success—grade point average (GPA) and credit completion ratio (CCR)—the academic achievement of PEP students was on a par with students in the non-PEP peer group but lower than students in the typical General College class group. Given the fact that PEP students entered the General College with weaker language and mathematic skills than students in both the control groups, the above data would indicate that, with respect to these measures, the PEP program's instructional modes were successful. However, even though PEP students performed adequately, their academic success was considerably below that anticipated by the planners of the PEP program. These lower-than-

anticipated academic results derived from the number of non-General College courses taken by PEP students, and the attendant lower completion ratios. These factors were neither foreseen nor planned for by PEP planners. In fact, such enrollment in non-General College courses, especially in the first quarter of the freshman year, is contrary to a long-standing policy of the College.[5] As a consequence of this circumstance, closer monitoring of registration in the PEP program will be one of the major concerns of the PEP staff in subsequent quarters of the program.

3. Retention rates for PEP students during the 1979-1980 academic year.

Retention rates for PEP students varied from quarter to quarter during the academic year. Despite PEP students' lower academic history and achievement records, during the fall and winter quarters the retention rates for PEP students remained at the same level as those in the two control groups. Thus, for example, the retention rate for PEP students was 92% during the fall quarter, but during the spring quarter the retention rate for PEP students decreased at a much higher rate than those of the two control groups.

	Decrease registration winter quarter	Decrease registration spring quarter
PEP students	-14%	-17%
Non-PEP peer group	-14%	- 4%
Regular GC class	-17%	- 7%

Within the three PEP packages, retention rates were:

	Registered all three quarters	Completed all three quarters
PEP I (American Indian)	56%	42%
PEP II (Chicano/Latino)	69%	67%
PEP III (Black)	79%	67%

[5]Except in special instances in which students are considered on an individual basis, General College freshmen are not usually permitted to enroll in non-General College courses during their first quarter; such enrollment is permitted only on a limited basis during a freshman's second quarter. (Exempt from this rule are non-General College physical education and music courses.) This practice of restricting General College students from "outside" courses until they have proved that they are capable of performing General College course work satisfactorily is supported by a substantial body of evidence. See, for instance, Assistant Dean Carol H. Pazandak's Predictors of Academic Success for Students Transferring from the General College to the College of Liberal Arts (University of Minnesota, Office of the Assistant Dean for Student Personnel, College of Liberal Arts, April, 1979, offset).

In comparison with the two control groups, retention rates for PEP students were:

PEP group	59%
Non-PEP peer group	64%
Regular GC class group	79%

Minor discrepancies in the figures are due to the fact that a few students in the PEP "stopped out" for the winter quarter and re-enrolled during the spring quarter.

Other significant data relating to the retention rate of PEP students are the following:

-- PEP students with the highest GPA's and percentage of credits completed in the fall quarter were most likely to remain in the program for the entire year.

-- A higher proportion of male students remained in the program than female students.

-- Students 23 years and older had a higher dropout rate than younger students.

-- There is a positive correlation between the retention rate of PEP students and the post-high school training or educational levels of their parents.

-- PEP students who aspired to advanced education beyond four years had a higher retention rate than those who did not.

Since accurate retention data for individual American Indian, Chicano/Latino and Black students within the University as a whole and within the General College are not available, it is difficult to ascertain the precise significance of the retention rates for students in the PEP program. However, directors of the University's Learning Resource Centers and other knowledgeable persons concerned with minority and ethnic programs in the University indicate that the retention rates for PEP students are indeed very impressive.

The minimal attrition rate among PEP students during the fall and winter quarters, 1979-80, was acceptable to PEP planners, since most of those who dropped out were non-serious students or students counseled out of the program for a variety of reasons. The inordinate dropout rate during the spring quarter, however, was a major concern for PEP planners. Critical review of retention data and conversations with program instructors, counselors and advisors indicate that there appear to be four major factors for the high spring quarter dropout rate.